



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,622	01/14/2005	Takeshi Hagio	59150-8030	2017
22918	7590	05/27/2009		
PERKINS COIE LLP P.O. BOX 1208 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208			EXAMINER FERNANDEZ, SUSAN EMILY	
			ART UNIT 1651	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/27/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,622

Applicant(s)

HAGIO ET AL.

Examiner

SUSAN E. FERNANDEZ

Art Unit

1651

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1.4.6.10-27.30-48 and 71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1.4.6.10-27.30-48 and 71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/003)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/12/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed February 13, 2009, has been received and entered.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7-9, 28, 29, and 49-70 are canceled. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-27, 30-48, and 71 are pending and examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-27, 30-48, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rickwood (WO 01/05994, listed on IDS) in view of Dev et al. (US 5,859,327).

Rickwood discloses a method of introducing a substance into a cell wherein bubbles containing gas are generated in a liquid medium comprising the cell, and the bubble interacts

with the cell to form a hole in the surface of the cell (page 2, last paragraph through page 3, first paragraph). The substance that can be introduced into a cell can be a nucleic acid (page 8, last paragraph). Transfection of the cells occurs at pressure below and above atmospheric pressure, such as a pressure of from 1×10^4 Pa to atmospheric pressure (page 6, last paragraph). Thus, the cell is subjected to depressurization. Finally, the Rickwood method can be performed on plant cells (page 9, first paragraph).

Rickwood also differs from the claimed invention in that it does not expressly disclose that the cell and nucleic acid are placed under conditions to induce electroporation, such as the application of a voltage pulse of 10 V/cm to 200 V/cm in at least two directions. Moreover, Rickwood does not expressly disclose that the plant cells treated are of the types recited in instant claims 10-26 wherein the steps can be performed on a seed, and that the treated plant cell differentiates/grows/multiplies and/or yields a plant which may not contain a somaclonal variation.

Dev et al. teaches "a method for producing a genetically modified plant by introducing a polynucleotide to an intact plant or plant cell(s) via electroporation, in the absence of cell wall-degrading enzymes" (abstract). The "plant cell" may be an intact cell of a seed (column 4, lines 15-17), wherein the recitation "intact" signifies that the cell wall is undamaged or untreated (column 4, lines 20-22). The method can be applied to monocotyledonous plants such as corn, wheat, rice, and dicotyledonous plants such as tomato, rapeseed, soybeans, and cabbage (column 6, lines 15-25). Moreover, Dev et al. indicates that "one of skill in the art could determine the appropriate parameters for the leaf type used" (column 8, lines 62-63). For instance, a voltage of

40-50 V/cm for electroporation, which is within the range recited in instant claim 6, is deemed suitable for "soft and thin" leaves (column 8, lines 63-65).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to have applied electroporation in addition to the steps recited in Rickwood. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since electroporation assists in the introduction of genetic material to plant cells, as demonstrated in Dev et al. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply electroporation as taught in Dev et al., to improve the genetic transfection method of Rickwood for the predictable result of introducing a substance into plant cells. The selection of a specific suitable voltage pulse and voltage pulse application directions, including that claimed, would have been an obvious matter of optimization on the part of the artisan of ordinary skill, particularly since Dev et al. demonstrates that the skilled artisan would determine the appropriate parameters for the leaf type used, and Dev et al. noted teaches that electroporation applied at a voltage of 40-50 V/cm, which is within the range recited in instant claim 6, is deemed suitable the introduction of a polynucleotide to "soft and thin" leaves.

Additionally, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in transferring nucleic acids into cells of plants of the types recited in the instant claims and the Dev reference to yield the predictable result of producing these plants.

Though Rickwood does not expressly disclose that the depressurization step is performed under a pressure reduced by about 0.096 MPa from the atmospheric pressure, the selection of a specific suitable pressure, including that claimed, would have been an obvious matter of optimization on the part of the artisan of ordinary skill. Moreover, in reference to pressure

conditions for transfection, Rickwood indicates that "Transfection can be carried out under widely varying conditions" (page 6, last paragraph).

Thus, a holding of obviousness is clearly required.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-27, 29-48, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmukler (US 5,173,158) in view of Gutierrez-Armenta et al. (US 2002/0046416) and Dev et al.

Schmukler teaches a method of electroporation wherein cells are trapped into pores in a film with diameters smaller than the diameters of the cells, and an electric field is applied to cause electroporation of the trapped cells (column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 3). The cells can be trapped into the pores by pressure such as hydrostatic pressure head from a regulated pressure source or a vacuum source (column 3, lines 20-26). Clearly the pressure applied to the cells must be different from atmospheric pressure. Thereafter, a low voltage pulse is applied which causes electroporation of the cells (column 3, lines 27-34). It is noted that "when the pressure gradient across the film is negative, or decreases from a positive value, the trapped first type of cells will pull in material, such as genetic material (DNA)..." from a portion of the apparatus used to perform the Schmukler invention (column 3, lines 44-47). Thus, the cells are exposed to depressurization.

Schmukler differs from the claimed invention in that it does not expressly disclose that the depressurization step is performed under a pressure reduced by about 0.096 MPa from the atmospheric pressure, as required by claims 1 and 27. Nevertheless, the selection of a specific suitable pressure, including that claimed, would have been an obvious matter of optimization on

the part of the artisan of ordinary skill, particularly since Schmukler teaches regulation of pressure applied (column 3, lines 20-26).

Furthermore, Schmukler differs from the claimed invention in that it does not expressly disclose that the cell treated is a plant cell of the types recited in instant claims 10-26 wherein the steps can be performed on a seed, and that the treated plant cell differentiates/grows/multiplies and/or yields a plant which may not contain a somaclonal variation. Moreover, there is no disclosure in Schmukler that the voltage pulse applied to the cell is of 10 V/cm to 200 V/cm, which is applied to the cell and the nucleic acid in at least two directions.

Gutierrez-Armenta et al. discloses that cell growth may be controlled by administering DNA to a cell, and that the DNA may be administered by electroporation of plant seed cells with DNA (page 2, paragraph [0015]).

Dev et al. teaches "a method for producing a genetically modified plant by introducing a polynucleotide to an intact plant or plant cell(s) via electroporation, in the absence of cell wall-degrading enzymes" (abstract). The "plant cell" may be an intact cell of a seed (column 4, lines 15-17), wherein the recitation "intact" signifies that the cell wall is undamaged or untreated (column 4, lines 20-22). The method can be applied to monocotyledonous plants such as corn, wheat, rice, and dicotyledonous plants such as tomato, rapeseed, soybeans, and cabbage (column 6, lines 15-25). Moreover, Dev et al. indicates that "one of skill in the art could determine the appropriate parameters for the leaf type used" (column 8, lines 62-63). For instance, a voltage of 40-50 V/cm for electroporation, which is within the range recited in instant claim 6, is deemed suitable for "soft and thin" leaves (column 8, lines 63-65).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to have practiced the invention on plant cells, which can be contained in seeds, to produce plants which may not contain a somaclonal variation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since electroporation has been found to be suitable for administering DNA to plant seed cells, and therefore, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in transferring nucleic acid into plant cells to produce a plant by the methods of Schmukler which uses electroporation for nucleic acid transfer into cells. Additionally, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in transferring nucleic acids into cells of plants of the types recited in the instant claims to yield the predictable result of producing these plants.

Also, the selection of a specific suitable voltage pulse and voltage pulse application directions, including that claimed, would have been an obvious matter of optimization on the part of the artisan of ordinary skill, particularly since Schmukler teaches regulation of pressure applied (column 3, lines 20-26). Also, Dev et al. demonstrates that the skilled artisan would determine the appropriate parameters for the leaf type used, and Dev et al. teaches that electroporation applied at a voltage of 40-50 V/cm, which is within the range recited in instant claim 6, is deemed suitable the introduction of a polynucleotide to "soft and thin" leaves. Moreover, Dev et al. also provides further support for administering DNA into cells of plants of the types recited in the instant claims by electroporation.

A holding of obviousness is clearly required.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 13, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While Rickwood (WO 01/05994) indicates that it is preferred that the method is carried out on a protoplast derived from the cell, it is only a preference and does not prohibit that the method is carried out on matter other than protoplasts. The applicant asserts that a method involving bubbles interacting with a cell surface to form holes in the cell surface would not work with plant cells contained within a seed and having an intact cell wall, but the applicant has not provided evidence to support this statement. As indicated in MPEP 2145, Section I, "The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record." Though Rickwood's disclosed range of pressures encompass a greater range of atmospheric pressure than the depressurized state required by the present claims, the recited pressures are rendered obvious since it would have been a matter of optimization on the part of the artisan of ordinary skill.

With respect to Dev, the applicant argues that Dev describes the transformation of dessicated seed embryos in the absence of cell wall degrading enzymes, via electroporation. However, this is only provided as an example of the invention (Example 1). The Dev invention is not only limited to embryos, as Dev points out that the plant cell used in the invention can refer to a seed (column 4, lines 15-16 and claim 2). Moreover, the electroporation of intact plant tissue can be performed on the whole, intact plant with no cutting or removing of a plant part (column 8, lines 1-3). Clearly the combination of Rickwood with the teachings of Dev renders obvious the claimed invention.

With respect to the obviousness rejection over Schmukler, Gutierrez-Armenta, and Dev, Dev teaches the transformation of seeds via electroporation and thus renders obvious the practice

of the Schmukler invention on seeds. Gutierrez-Armenta also provides further support for the electroporation of plant seed cells with DNA. The applicant asserts that Gutierrez-Armenta does not teach or suggest transformation of a plant cell having an intact cell wall and within a seed. However, Gutierrez-Armenta clearly points to electroporation of plant seed cells (page 2, paragraph [0015]) and the applicant has not provided evidence to show that the plant cells/ plant seed cells do not have an intact cell wall.

Therefore, the rejections of record must be maintained.

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN E. FERNANDEZ whose telephone number is (571)272-3444. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leon B Lankford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

Susan E. Fernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 1651

sef